```
01B5parS
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                             New York, N.Y.
                                             22 Cr. 311 (MKV)
 4
                 V.
5
      JEFFREY SOBERMAN PARKET,
6
                    Defendant.
          -----x
 7
 8
                                              January 11, 2024
                                              2:05 p.m.
9
10
     Before:
11
                          HON. MARY KAY VYSKOCIL,
12
                                              U.S. District Judge
13
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
          United States Attorney for the
          Southern District of New York
16
     BY: JANE CHONG
17
          Assistant United States Attorney
     FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK
18
          Attorneys for Defendant
     BY: AMY GALLICCHIO
19
               -and_
20
     LANKLER, SIFFERT & WOHL, LLP
     BY: LISE E. RAHDERT
21
     ALSO PRESENT: MARK RIZZO, Inspector, U.S. Postal Service
22
23
24
25
```

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, starting for the government please state your name for the record.

MS. CHONG: Good afternoon, your Honor. Jane Chong for the government, and I am joined at counsel table by U.S. Postal Inspector Mark Rizzo.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Chong. Good afternoon to you, Inspector Rizzo. I have seen your name, so thank you for being here today.

MS. RAHDERT: Good afternoon, your Honor. Lise
Rahdert, Lankler, Siffert & Wohl on behalf of Jeffrey Parket,
and I am joined at counsel table by my co-counsel Amy
Gallicchio of Federal Defenders of New York.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to both of you.

MS. RAHDERT: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: And good afternoon to you Mr. Parket, you say it; right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Good afternoon as well to our court reporter. Thank you.

As you know, I am Judge Vyscocil and we are here this afternoon for the purpose of sentencing Mr. Parket. Sir, let me just confirm for the record that you do speak and understand English clearly.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And you do not need the services of an interpreter?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Ms. Chong, are there victims entitled to notice? I know we have some victim impact statements but has everyone entitled to notice been given notice?

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So, by way of background, Mr. Parket was charged initially in a six-count complaint. On February 15th, he waived indictment and the government filed a superseding information which contained four counts, but pursuant to a plea agreement with the government, Mr. Parket pled guilty to two counts of that information: Count One, which charged him with wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343 and 2, and Count Three of that information charges him with bank fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 1344 and 2.

Since that time the Probation Office has completed its investigation, the parties have filed their sentencing submissions. Please listen very carefully. I'm going to state for the record what it is I have before me that I have considered in connection with today's sentencing and I want to be sure I'm not missing anything. All right?

O1B5parS

So, I have first the revised final presentence report filed on May 9, 2023, that's at ECF no. 58. I will note that the Probation Office made a number of revisions in response to comments or requests from the defense including to paragraphs 9, 27, 63, 64, and then there were additional comments or additions that resulted in changes to paragraphs 8(k), 17, 24, 54, 56, 58, 59, 65, 68, 70, 72, 74, 75, 79, 82, 84 through 87, and a footnote was added to paragraph 90.

In terms of objections, it is the Court's understanding that the government provided no objections to probation but did note, make a comment to probation which resulted in an amendment to paragraph 11 with regard to the amount of fraudulent loans obtained.

In a letter dated May 1st, defense counsel provided objections to five of the paragraphs: Paragraph 19, 20, 27, 30, and Appendix A of the PSR. I will turn to ruling on those in a moment but for now I am noting what it is that I have.

I will note that in addition, in connection with the defense submission, there were a number of additional comments or corrections that were made belatedly, untimely, to paragraph 63, 69, 70, 83, and 90.

In addition, I have Mr. Parket's sentencing submission that I just alluded to that was filed on June 14; that's at ECF no. 65. That contained two corresponding appendices and 12 exhibits. Those exhibits include a letter from Mr. Parket

himself, seven letters of support submitted on his behalf, two exhibits from his attorneys relating to involvement in the whistle-blower action, they were filed under seal, a history of Mr. Parket's blood donations at the New York Blood Center, and a declaration from a professor at Harvard regarding certain sentencing statistics.

Then I received, with leave of Court, a supplemental sentencing submission from Mr. Parket filed on November 9, 2023. That's at ECF no. 91. That's under seal, as is at least parts of the initial sentencing submission.

I then have the government's sentencing submission which was filed untimely on November 13 of 2023. That's at ECF no. 93. That submission was due on November 9th. On November 13th, at 4-something in the morning, the Court received an e-mail from the government apologizing for filing its submission in an untimely manner and explaining that it had the sentencing calendared for the wrong date. It seems to be a consequence of the fact that things were adjourned several times. I will just note for the record it is really not acceptable for the government to file things late. I do have the government's apology and I have taken the submission into account, obviously.

I also have seven victim impact statements along with the victim identifier numbers that the government proposes that we use today for any victims who wish to speak.

Then, last night I received a letter from the government with a request that the government be permitted to read to me a victim impact statement of a victim who had hoped to be here, as I understand it, but was unable to be here. I will note that I have carefully read and reviewed that statement. It appears to parallel one of the seven statements that were provided; is that correct?

MS. CHONG: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Then I have a consent preliminary order of forfeiture as to specific property and money judgment which was signed by all parties, so ordered by the Court on February 15 of 2023. I have a stipulation and order which was signed on September 25, 2023, that's at ECF no. 84, that is a stipulation between the government and a third-party petitioner, Robyn Parket, where the government recognizes the petitioner's interest in a portion of the specific property in the preliminary order of forfeiture.

I then have a proposed, what's labeled, Consent Order of Restitution. It is my understanding that's now been signed; is that correct?

MS. CHONG: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And what was given to the Court is in fact on consent, counsel? I am asking the defense.

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: And Ms. Dempsey, you have that signed order? 2 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 So that is the entirety of what the Court has before 6 it and has considered in connection with sentencing. Is that 7 the totality of the record, Ms. Chong? 8 MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Are you taking the lead, Ms. Rahdert? 10 MS. RAHDERT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Is that the totality of the record? 12 MS. RAHDERT: Yes, it is your Honor. I just want to 13 note for clarity for the record that our supplement was filed 14 on November 6. 15 THE COURT: OK. It is at ECF no. 9 in any event. That will reflect whatever the date is but the date is not 16 17 really material; right? 18 MS. RAHDERT: Correct, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Thank you. 20 So let me first ask Ms. Rahdert, have you had the 21 opportunity to read the presentence report, to discuss it with 22 your client, and to lodge any comments or objections? 23 MS. RAHDERT: Yes, we have, your Honor. I just want 24 to let the Court know that although we did make some objections 25 in the original draft that probation did not implement, we are

no longer pursuing those objections, and the only corrections on which we request a ruling from the Court are the ones listed in the appendix to our sentencing submission.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. I will go through them one by one just to confirm with you though. OK?

Mr. Parket, have you had the opportunity to review the presentence report, to talk to your lawyers about it, to raise with them any objections, concerns, or comments that you might have?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has the government read the presentence report and tendered any objections it wishes to make?

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: One final question. The Court is in possession, as I mentioned, of originally there were seven victim impact statements. I received, really in effect, a duplicate last night. Has the defense seen all of those?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, we have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because, as you know, I would be obligated to disclose any information that's not publicly part of the record, but you have them and you are aware of them and you have whatever opportunity you wish to respond and to comment; right?

MS. RAHDERT: That's correct, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me ask a few questions of the parties.

With respect to forfeiture, as I previously noted, I did enter a consent preliminary order of forfeiture as to specific property and money judgment, a sum of money equal to \$65,441,683.82 representing the proceeds chargeable to the offenses charged in Count One and Three, together with certain specific property that was the subject of that forfeiture order. As I said earlier, Ms. Robyn Parket, the defendant's, I believe, wife or ex-wife, filed petition for a forfeiture hearing but that issue has now been resolved pursuant to the stipulation that is on the docket at ECF no. 84. Is that accurate?

MS. CHONG: That's accurate, your Honor.

THE COURT: From the defense's point of view is that accurate?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is Robyn Parket in attendance?

MS. RAHDERT: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything further that the Court needs to do with respect to the forfeiture issue, Ms. Chong?

MS. CHONG: At the moment, no, your Honor. However, I have conferred with the clerks in our office who work on forfeiture matters and they inform me that per their normal practice, after the sentence is imposed they will send to the Court a package that consists of a declaration and final order of forfeiture.

O1B5parS

THE COURT: Thank you. But, for the record, that final order of forfeiture is part of the Court's sentencing here and will be incorporated into the judgment that I will enter.

With respect to restitution, you have confirmed that that has now been signed so I can move on from there.

With respect to the stipulated guidelines range, I just want to put on the record that the parties entered into their plea agreement in August of 2022 and stipulated to a -- no?

MS. RAHDERT: Your Honor, I believe the final plea agreement is dated January 30th of 2023.

THE COURT: Let me take a look. What date are you telling me?

MS. RAHDERT: January 20th of 2023.

THE COURT: In any event, it included a stipulated guidelines range of 121 to 151 months. I issued an order directing the parties, I issued that on November 9 of 2023, asking the parties to submit a letter advising the Court before the sentencing of the impact of any amendments to the Sentencing Guidelines that went into effect on November 1st of 2023. The parties filed a joint letter — this really should be referenced as part of the record in connection with today's sentencing — that letter is ECF no. 94, informing the Court that Mr. Parket does not qualify for the two-level offense

level reduction for zero point defendants. Mr. Parket doesn't contest this fact and the guidelines range of 121 to 151 months remains unchanged.

Is that accurate, Ms. Chong?

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Rahdert?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, it is. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Let me ask defense counsel, have you reviewed with Mr. Parket the mandatory, standard, and special conditions of supervised release that have been proposed by probation in the PSR?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, we have.

THE COURT: Are you comfortable with my referring to the mandatory and standard conditions generically rather than putting them on the record verbatim?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, we are, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Parket, have you reviewed those conditions with your lawyer and do you understand all of them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Specifically, with respect to the special conditions, I am obligated by the Second Circuit to put those on the record. Probation has proposed that if there is a term of supervised release after any term of imprisonment that you, during that period, participate in outpatient mental health

treatment approved by the Probation Office, that you continue to take any prescribed medication unless otherwise instructed by your healthcare provider, and that you contribute to the costs of services rendered based on your ability to pay or on the availability of any third-party payments like insurance, for example.

I would authorize the release of available evaluations and reports including the presentence report to the healthcare provider.

Next, Probation recommends that there be a search condition which would provide that you submit your person, any property, residence, vehicle, papers, computer, or other electronic communication, data storage device, cloud storage, or media and effects, to a search by any United States probation officer who, if needed, could enlist the assistance of law enforcement. Any such search would be conducted when there is a reasonable suspicion concerning violation of a condition of supervision or any unlawful conduct by the person being supervised, which obviously is you, Mr. Parket. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release and you would be ordered to warn any other occupants of your premises that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to the condition. I would order that any search be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

There is also a recommended condition that you provide

O1B5parS

25

the probation officer with access to any requested financial 1 information and that you not incur new credit charges or open 2 3 any additional lines of credit without the approval of the 4 probation officer, unless you are in compliance with the 5 payment schedule with regard to any financial penalties. 6 Do you understand all of those conditions, Mr. Parket? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Have you had the chance to talk to your 9 lawyers about them? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. 11 THE COURT: Are there any objections to those special 12 conditions? 13 MS. RAHDERT: No, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 15 Does the government still agree that Mr. Parket is entitled to a two-level reduction in the offense level 16 calculation based on clearly demonstrated acceptance of 17 18 responsibility? Yes, your Honor. 19 MS. CHONG: 20 THE COURT: And does the government intend to move for 21 a further one-level reduction based on timely notice of intent 22 to plea? 23 MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: The motion is granted and I did, in doing

my own independent guidelines calculation, anticipate that the

motion would be made and granted, so I have factored in a three-level reduction in the calculation of Mr. Parket's offense level.

Let me turn to the objections to the PSR or the comments that were raised by the defense. So, counsel, are you telling me that the objections to paragraphs 19 -- well, let me go one by one. 19; is that withdrawn?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection to paragraph 20; is that withdrawn?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes.

THE COURT: Paragraph 27?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes.

THE COURT: Paragraph 30?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes.

THE COURT: And there was an objection to Appendix A arguing that the information from the JSIN database is not sufficiently reliable or relevant.

MS. RAHDERT: We are not pursuing that objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: I hope not, in light of the fact that you put in your own statistics.

All right. Now, there were a number of items that you raised in your actual submission so let me go through them one by one. I will say, to be perfectly honest, these appear to be

either non-controversial or not particularly significant, so what I am going to do is state them, you can correct me if I misstate it in any way, and then I want to know, Ms. Chong, whether you agree or have any objections.

So, there is a comment with respect to paragraph 63. Counsel requests that the PSR be amended to reflect that Mr. Parket's son, Brett Parket, attempted to return the phone call from Officer Hay, to complete an interview.

Is there an objection?

MS. CHONG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will recommend that the PSR be amended to reflect that there was an attempt to return that call. Does that satisfy the defense position?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes. Thank you.

THE COURT: Paragraph 69, counsel, notes that Mr. Parket's hospitalization at Gracie Square took place in December of 2021, not 2022, and asks that the PSR reflect the accurate date and that the reference to November 31 be changed to November 30th.

Does the government agree with these amendments?

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In paragraph 70, the defense asks that the PSR be amended to clarify that one of the substances used by Mr. Parket in his suicide attempt was rubbing alcohol, not simply alcohol. Is that accurate?

1 MS. RAHDERT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Does the government object to that 3 amendment being made? 4 MS. CHONG: No, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: In paragraph 83, defense counsel asserts 6 that the PSR incorrectly reports that Mr. Parket was stationed 7 in California when, in reality, he was on a business trip in California during the September 11, 2001 attack, and asks that 8 9 the PSR be amended to indicate that he was living in New York 10 at the time. 11 MS. RAHDERT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Is that the substance? 13 Any objection? 14 MS. CHONG: No objection, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: And finally, with regard to paragraph 90, counsel asserts that Mr. Parket sold the house on 10 Central 16 17 Drive -- I don't know where that is. Where is that? 18 MS. RAHDERT: It is in Great Neck. 19 THE COURT: In Great Neck; in October of 2016, and 20 that he sold the house at 7 Fairfield Drive. Where is that 21 one? 22 MS. RAHDERT: Also in Great Neck. 23 THE COURT: In Great Neck; in 1994, and requests that 24 the PSR be amended to make clear that he no longer owns those 25 two properties.

1 Is that accurate? 2 MS. RAHDERT: Yes. Thank you. 3 MS. CHONG: No objection, your Honor. So we will indicate in the judgment in 4 THE COURT: 5 this matter that those five corrections should be made. 6 Does that take care of the entirety of any objections 7 or comments by the defense? MS. RAHDERT: Yes, it does, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: And there are no last minute objections by 10 the government; right? 11 MS. CHONG: That's correct, your Honor. Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. So, with that, then I will 13 make those corrections. 14 I will note that the guidelines calculation in the PSR 15 is consistent with the parties' stipulated guidelines calculation and it is also consistent with the independent 16 17 calculation that I have done which I will put on the record in 18 a few moments. So, with the five revisions we have just talked about, the PSR will be made part of the record in this matter, 19 20 will be filed under seal. If any appeal is taken, counsel on 21 the appeal may have access to the PSR without the need for any 22 further application to the Court. 23 Ms. Chong, would you wish to be heard? 24 MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor. 25 And I'm open to hearing from the parties, THE COURT:

by the way, about where during the proceeding you think it is appropriate for any victims who want to address the Court to be heard. My own inclination is they should speak after you, but I don't know if you have a view on that.

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor; the government agrees with the Court.

THE COURT: Anything from the defense on the ordering?

MS. RAHDERT: That's fine with the defense, your

Honor.

THE COURT: That way you will hear what they have to say, if there is anything you want to say in response before you speak.

MS. RAHDERT: Thank you. Appreciate that.

THE COURT: Ms. Chong.

MS. CHONG: Your Honor, may I use the podium?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. CHONG: This is an extraordinary and elaborate fraud perpetrated by a single individual who, by his own account, had it all — a happy marriage, close relationship with his adult children, and a large extended family that included a loving stepmother, siblings, in—laws. Jeffrey Parket also enjoyed a lifetime of financial success as a bond trader, hedge fund founder, and investor, and amassed millions of dollars in personal wealth. But, he lost that fortune. And rather than rely on his extensive support network or any of the

other resources at his disposal, he decided to just fake it.

For five years he maintained his comfortable lifestyle by deceiving and systematically stealing from, yes, sophisticated individual and institutional lenders who thought they were giving short-term loans to a well-established financial professional. But that's not all. He also took millions of dollars from close friends and family members who trusted him to responsibly borrow money from them, or in the case of the family members, to invest their money for them and keep it safe not only because he is a financial whiz but because he is their friend, their father, their stepson.

In his written submission to the Court the defendant professes remorse for his actions but he also insists that he should not spend a single day behind bars. And to support that position, he makes two arguments that I expect the defense will make again today. Neither of these arguments has any merits. First, he argues that the guidelines range of 121 to 151 months is just too high because it was mostly calculated, as these ranges are in fraud cases, using the large loss amount in this case.

Second, he argues that no prison time is warranted under the Section 3553(a) factors. I think the Court can easily reject both of these arguments based on the specific and truly egregious facts of this case.

The defendant has devoted pages to arguing that the

Sentencing Guidelines focus unduly on the amount of loss. The government is familiar with the Second Circuit's case law on this point and of course this Court is familiar with those arguments. But I think what matters here is that even if there are fraud cases out there for which an argument could be made that the guidelines range unduly focuses on the loss amount, this is just not that case. Even if this Court were to largely set aside the loss amount, many other factors weigh strongly in favor of the decade-plus sentence set out in the guidelines range and those are, of course, the factors in Section 3553(a).

First, the nature and circumstance of the offense stand out for their egregiousness starting with the length, the scale, and the elaborateness of the fraud. This is a defendant who carefully constructed and methodically perpetrated his Ponzi-like fraud for five years, lying to at least two dozen lenders to abstain an astonishing \$65 million in loans which he paid back in increments by ensnaring more victims in his scheme. All told, 17 of his victims lost a total of \$37 million.

I want to specifically address how it was that he was able to pull this off for so long, and that is really the story of the intricate nature of the fraud.

Unsurprisingly, the defendant was able to steal from close family members through fairly simple means: By lying about his assets and lying about what he was going to do with

their money. But many of his victims were not family members, they are sophisticated financial actors who did their due diligence. They consulted lawyers, they required extensive proof of collateral before giving the defendant a dime. That means the defendant needed to construct a mountain of extremely detailed and believable paperwork. In fact, he had to provide more than that because a key part of the defendant's story for why he needed loans, despite being personally extremely wealthy, was his claim that most of his assets were restricted or illiquid and could not be easily accessed without, for example, significant penalties.

This Court will hear today from one victim whom I will refer to as Victim 1, who despite a close professional connection to the defendant, insisted that the defendant provide all of the corroboration necessary to show that any loan would be secure. So the defendant did not just provide elaborate paperwork, he claimed he would put the victim in touch with business executives who would vouch for the defendant's investments and the circumstances of their illiquidity. What the defendant did instead was steal the identities of three real corporate executives and impersonate them by e-mail and phone.

I will move on here to the history and characteristics of this defendant and why they favor a guideline sentence.

Now, it is true the defendant has no criminal history

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and it is true that he confessed to his crimes. The government agrees that the Court should consider those things in imposing a sentence. But I think what is more relevant here and more revealing of his characteristics over the long-term, the kind of person Jeffrey Parket is, is the fact that he only confessed after perpetrating this fraud for an astonishing five years and after losing almost all of the money he had borrowed. And just to be clear, because of how the defendant structured this fraud, because it was a fraud he perpetrated against not strangers over the internet but people he knew intimately, these were loans he took out in his own legal name. For those reasons, his confession was in fact utterly unnecessary to prosecute this case. Indeed, as this Court knows, the government opened the case, spoke to multiple victims and collected evidence of the defendant's guilt, before speaking with him.

Quite creatively, the defendant also argues that he should be sentenced as if he is a government cooperator because of that confession to his crimes and because he has also separately filed whistle-blower suits identifying the misconduct of others. My understanding is he is also committed to filing more whistle-blower suits if he can.

The government could not disagree more with the notion that the whistle-blower efforts that the defendant is making somehow entitle him to a lesser sentence. As a starting matter

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on this question of whether the defendant should be considered an informal cooperator, signing up the defendant as a cooperator was never on the table because as a one-man fraud mastermind, the only person he could have given information against was himself. But more importantly, as to the whistle-blower arguments, I think the defendant has it exactly The Court should consider the defendant's work on backward. whistle-blower cases which, yes, the defendant says he is pursuing to try to repay his victims with the millions that he hopes to get in whistle-blower awards, but even if those awards in fact came down tomorrow and totally covered the victims' financial loss, that would mean that the defendant absolutely had alternatives to the fraud that he perpetrated. If the whistle-blower filings are successful, in fact what they show is that the defendant, as an educated and experienced financial professional, had skills that he could tap, he had analytical abilities that most people probably only dream of, he had alternatives to whatever desperate personal financial situation he found himself in. Instead, he chose to do the unthinkable. Not a mistake, but five years of decisions.

And that brings me to the other Section 3553(a) facts.

THE COURT: Before you leave the whistle-blower suits can I ask you, have you been in touch at all with -- I understand these are largely in coordination with the Eastern District; right? Not here?

O1B5parS

MS. CHONG: My understanding is that the Eastern District of New York was interested in at least one case.

THE COURT: Have you been in touch with any of the other U.S. Attorney offices with respect to these whistle-blower cases?

MS. CHONG: No, your Honor, and the government has chosen not to interact with the SEC on possible whistle-blower matters. I spoke with a prosecutor on an Eastern District of New York case and he made very clear that he was not asking the government to do anything in particular and he was not seeking in any way to influence the sentencing in this case.

THE COURT: I do note for the record that there are no submissions by any other government authorities or prosecutors or SEC officials in connection with those suits. Right? Am I correct about that?

MS. CHONG: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. CHONG: Just one more point on the whistle-blower suits, your Honor. I think it would be particularly disturbing if an individual, who is capable of filing rigorous and perhaps meritorious whistle-blower suits, was awarded for choosing not to use those skills and, frankly, uses those skills now after the fraud, as a get-out-of-jail-free card. I think that that is not how justice works and the defendant does need to understand that. I think that's what brings me to the other

Section 3553(a) factors, which is the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide a just punishment, and to deter other further crimes.

For all of the reasons stated, the guidelines range is appropriate to accomplish these goals, and the seriousness of the offense goes well beyond the huge amount of money that the defendant took from so many victims. Here, I think it's important to emphasize, that when thinking about the seriousness of the defendant and the importance of promoting respect for the law, we need to consider how the defendant executed his crimes and his relationships with the people he betrayed. This is not a defendant who stole money from people and institutions he felt could afford the loss. In fact, the defendant defrauded family, friends, and colleagues repeatedly, and thereby ensured maximum harm to those individuals because part of his strategy was to target people in his orbit whose financial circumstances were sometimes known to him. He cannot claim he did not know how his fraud would affect them.

This Court will hear today from a victim whom I will refer to as Victim 9, who will describe in trusting the defendant to help manage her financial accounts only to learn that instead of helping her, he systematically helped himself to her money.

Another victim, whom I will refer to as Victim 1, will

describe losing a lifetime of labor to the defendant's deception, and that is specifically because the defendant didn't just take one big loan from that victim and walk away. He went back to the same well over and over using elaborate ruses to pressure the victim to issue additional loans. He did that despite knowing full well that by utterly devastating this victim, by squeezing this victim dry, he would leave the victim unable to support his dependents or pay his family's medical bills. That is all relevant in considering what kind of sentence would truly reflect the seriousness of this offense. In a word, it is the premeditated cruelty in how the defendant executed his scheme.

Lastly, a guideline sentence is needed to deter the defendant from future crimes but, just as importantly, to send a message to others like him who would consider choosing to destroy others so that they can live in comfort and convenience.

Now, I think deterrence is of course always an important goal of sentencing but I want to suggest it is particularly important in this case where the harm cannot be measured in monetary loss alone. By deliberately exploiting his personal relationships and leveraging his unique professional skill set to obtain these loans, the defendant exposed his victims to enormous and lasting emotional and mental harm. This harm was not done at simply the individual

or interpersonal level, though that would be terrible enough.

The defendant's fraud actually undermined the basic trust that is so essential to the functioning of our financial system.

To explain what I mean I would like to point to one of the victims, a specialty finance company whose representative could not be here today. This representative submitted a letter to the Court explaining, in heartbreaking detail, that the millions the defendant took, consist largely of the careful investments and life savings of hard-working individuals and small family offices in the midwest. These are people who never met Jeffrey Parket and who sought to simply responsibly invest their money through a company they believed in, a company that had worked to build its reputation for almost two decades. The defendant's fraud is a blow to this entire intricate system, this web of hard work, smart investment, and institutional safety that allows us to invest our money, to hope it will grow, to dream about a future.

The defendant is absolutely deserving of a sentence within the guidelines range.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

At this time I am prepared to hear from the victims.

Now, as I understand it, Ms. Chong, we have three victims then

who are present today and wish to be heard. We have the fourth

who originally had planned to be heard today and wasn't able to

make it; you submitted a written statement. I don't think there is a need for that to be read aloud in court. I had it in written form and now I have the additional submission that you made last night. I have read it carefully.

The defense does have that one as well, right?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So we have three victims who wish to be heard today.

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So you have referred to them as I understand it as Victims 1, 9, and 11?

MS. CHONG: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. So Victim 1? I thank all of you for being here.

VICTIM 1: Your Honor, I want to thank the Court for this opportunity to say something about the impact Jeffrey's crimes have had on me personally and, more importantly, on my family.

I spent many painful hours drafting the very detailed impact statement submitted to the Court almost six months ago, so today I will be brief if only to spare my family any further shame and to not overshadow the content of my written statement that I spent so much time on.

THE COURT: Let me just interrupt you to assure you and everybody else, I have very carefully read all of those

statements.

VICTIM 1: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I appreciate the time that you took.

VICTIM 1: It is also very hard for me, your Honor, to stand up here as a victim. That's not how I have ever thought of myself. I am embarrassed and ashamed that Jeffrey has turned me into one. And what he has taken from me is so much more than just financial. It's true, Jeffrey stole an enormous amount of money from me, money that I earned over a lifetime of 70 and 80-hour workweeks, money that I earned to provide for my three children, elderly parents, and for my entire extended family. Yes, he took all of that. But he took so much more.

Jeffrey robbed me of my ability to trust those I consider friends. This is a man I had known for over 20 years, someone I thought of as a mentor, as family. He robbed me of my belief in myself. How foolish must I be to have trusted this person? It has affected my ability to function with the confidence I have had for years at my work. It has affected the way I carry myself with my wife and my children because I felt such shame at jeopardizing their well being. It has infected every aspect of my life. I have not had a single good night's sleep in the two years since I realized what Jeffrey had done to me. My head spins when I think that now I work to support and take care of my family. I can tell you, I work not to support and take care of my family, but rather to pay off

debt I incurred to finance Jeffrey's scheme and lavish lifestyle of his own family.

My stomach turns when I think of the image of me in my office until all hours of the night away from my family, earning money to support them, while Jeffrey sat at home unemployed, putting together fake bank statements, and forging signatures of executives of public companies to steal my money.

My heart breaks when I see my parents scared about the future of their care.

My eyes well up any time I have to deny my children anything because of what he did to me and to them.

Your Honor, Jeffrey stole my peace of mind. In a word, he has left me completely empty.

Since I have submitted my written statement I have had the chance to read Jeffrey's letter to the Court and I have seen him pass his crime off as a mistake, a one-off lapse in judgment. He talks about how sorry he is. Your Honor, I have been down this road before and I can tell the Court from my own pain and my own experience that this is just the next step from the same con that Jeffrey has been committing for five years.

Please remember, your Honor, that this is not one incident, one bad decision, one lie that he told in order to steal from faceless investors in some public company. This is a man who stole from his own mother, from his brothers, from his best friends, from the people who had spent a lifetime

caring for him, trusting him, supporting him. This is not a fraud that involved one false statement or one phony document. Jeffrey stole from us by telling lie upon lie, for month after month, year after year, by creating hundreds of false documents, by forging people's signatures including his elderly aunt and mother, pretending to be corporate executives at public companies, so that he could give himself references for me.

My mind reels when I think of the lengths he went to in order to steal money from me and my family. It has literally made me physically ill thinking about how I financed his ability to take advantage of the good faith of his other victims and their willingness to help him.

Your Honor, as Jeffrey's largest victim by far, I have put tremendous pressure on myself these past two years in connection with my written impact statement and in addressing you today. How am I going to show you who this man really is? The evil, the conceit, the smugness. But, in his letter to the Court, he made it easy. He showed you for himself. In his letter, Jeffrey talks about how he is going to pay all of us back, how he is going to fix things. He says he is working as a whistle-blower and that is because he is feeling true contrition. I know this is a lie.

Shortly after I realized Jeffrey had stolen everything from me, while I was absorbing the enormity of the situation

and before I first spoke with prosecutors, I received a call from Jeffrey's first lawyer. He told me that Jeffrey was going to earn a fortune as a whistle-blower and that if I didn't turn Jeffrey in to the authorities, he would use that money to pay me back. Indeed, two weeks ago, during the holidays, Jeffrey had the audacity to direct his lawyer to harass me during the holidays with my family and tell me that it was in my best interest to ask the Court to help him with his whistle-blower case. I couldn't believe it then and it is even more difficult to believe it now. Jeffrey was trying to buy my silence and my cooperation now with this nonsense about whistle-blower money. And when I read Jeffrey's letter to the Court, I saw that because that didn't work, he is now trying to buy his way out of prison with the same false promise to you.

Jeffrey is an imposter and a failure, that is what he has been for 20 years, and now he is trying a new scheme, a new role as some kind of whistle-blower to stay out of jail based upon things that he has read in the newspaper. It would be funny if it were not so serious and the stakes were not so high. He must be stopped. You see, your Honor, none of this is about remorse or about feeling sorry for the people he has hurt, it is about Jeffrey trying to advance his own interests by lying to everyone else about what he is going to do for them.

I thank the Court for listening to me today and I

thank all the people standing behind me who came to support me today and at all the prior hearings. I thank the prosecutor and the inspectors for prosecuting this case so well. And I thank your Honor for holding Jeffrey to account with the maximum sentence for what he has done, for the harm that he has caused to me and my family and so many others. I beg you to deliver justice today.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Victim 9; Ms. Chong, is that the next person?

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor; Victim 9.

THE COURT: Can you give me one second, please?

(Pause)

THE COURT: Ma'am, I am sorry. Thank you.

VICTIM 9: Your Honor, I, too, have given you a very detailed victim impact statement and today I am just going to say a few brief things.

I am Jeffrey Parket's stepmother and have raised him like my own child from the time he was 16 years old. As you know, I have submitted a detailed victim impact statement and want to reiterate a few key points about how Jeffrey's unconscionable and manipulative fraud affected myself and my family.

I had been blessed with remarkably good health my entire life until Jeffrey's crimes were revealed. Since then, my health has been severely impacted. I can never get back the

years that I have lost due to health issues, nor can I look forward to the same quality of time and experiences I could have had in future years.

My husband of 38 years, Jeffrey's father, passed away in May 2018. He grew up in foster homes for most of his childhood.

THE COURT: You are talking about your husband now; right?

VICTIM 9: My husband.

THE COURT: Yes.

VICTIM 9: And he was faced with unimaginable obstacles. Through education, honesty, and hard work, he built a secure life for his family and focused on imparting his values to his children. To think that Jeffrey would have stolen from his father is simply incomprehensible. Our family has been severed. I am separated from Jeffrey's family. The loss of my three grandsons is a loss that I grieve every day.

As with many of his victims, the financial impact of Jeffrey's crimes on my life has been devastating. Jeffrey's father worked so hard as a college and graduate school professor to save a nest egg for me as he was older than I. Jeffrey manipulated to steal these assets and has left me in a very difficult position. I have to move out of my apartment and find housing in a vastly different price range. Not only did he steal from me but from his sister and brother and future

generations who ultimately would have benefited.

As one can imagine, friendships in Great Neck,
Florida, and now New York City, have been compromised. It is
humiliating to have a family member who has pled guilty to
criminal charges. I cannot explain Jeffrey's reason for
committing these crimes to those who frequently ask, nor do I
want to talk about it. I experience emotional stress and feel
stigmatized. As a result, I avoid people whose company I used
to enjoy and destinations that I used to frequent.

In summary, I am suffering severe physical pain without a diagnosis and cure. I have lost relationships with loved ones and friends. My financial security has been significantly impacted. I fear for my future. My sleepless nights are unending. I do not know what I am going to do.

Jeffrey has destroyed my life as well as the lives of others. Jeffrey defrauded all of us who loved and respected him. And why? So he could live an extraordinarily opulent lifestyle? Even if he was down on his luck, his worst case lifestyle is so much better than most people could ever dream of. His crimes were pointless and selfish and knowingly perpetrated through extraordinarily calculated manipulations. I believe he should pay for his crimes and be sentenced to the maximum extent permitted by law.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you for being here.

O1B5parS

THE COURT: Victim 11; is that correct, Ms. Chong.

Thank you.

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor; Victim 11.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Good afternoon, sir.

VICTIM 9:

VICTIM 11: Good afternoon, your Honor. I have also submitted a victim statement and I believe that you have read it so I have a short brief comment to state today.

I have known Mr. Parket for over 10 years and have become very close friends with him over that time. At the same time, I am one of the victims of his crimes, and with the exception of his recent actions, he has been the one person who has always helped everyone. I cannot express or put into words how much he has guided myself and my family over the years.

As a victim, everyone's natural reaction is punishment. However, my priority as a victim is to recover the money that I have lost. The amount of loss may not be large compared to some corporations, funds, or wealthy individuals, but it is certainly very significant to me.

Since Mr. Parket's arrest I know he has been working day and night to try to repay his victims. I believe the Court is aware of Mr. Parket's efforts with the government agencies which hopefully has the real possibility to earn enough money to make full or partial, at least substantial restitution to his victims. Incarceration in this case could prevent

Mr. Parket's work and prohibit or hinder his efforts to pay back his victims. I understand this is a unique situation but I would implore the Court to prioritize and consider victims' recovery as a priority in any sentence here.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

I will note again that I do have the written statement from the Victim 16, both in its original form and then what was submitted last night, which as I say, I don't think there is a need to read aloud. I have carefully read it along with each of the victim impact statements.

So, at this time does counsel for the defense wish to be heard?

MS. RAHDERT: Yes, your Honor. May we confer very briefly before being heard?

THE COURT: Yes, you may. Before you do, actually -- and then we will take a brief break. Do you need a break?

MS. RAHDERT: No, I don't need a break, just a moment to confer. Thank you for asking.

THE COURT: I want to raise one issue. What I was looking for, and I apologize, I didn't mean to keep people waiting to address the Court so I apologize to you, but was there a condition of release that Mr. Parket not be in touch with his victims?

MS. CHONG: There was not, your Honor, in part because

21

22

23

24

25

of the fact that many of his victims are actually close friends 1 and family members so that did pose difficulty. That said, 2 3 when victims informed the Court, the government then confirmed with defense counsel that no further contact should be made as 4 5 with the victim in this case who mentioned the issue. 6 THE COURT: All right. Do you want to recess for your 7 time? 8 MS. RAHDERT: Yes; maybe a five-minute recess, your 9 Honor, if that's acceptable? 10 THE COURT: We will take a brief recess then. Let my 11 Court deputy know when you are ready. 12 MS. RAHDERT: Thank you. We will. 13 (Recess) 14 THE COURT: Ms. Rahdert, are you going to address the 15 Court? 16 MS. RAHDERT: Yes, your Honor. May I do so from the 17 podium? THE COURT: Of course. Sure. 18 19 MS. RAHDERT: Thank you. 20 Good afternoon again, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. RAHDERT: Before I begin my remarks, I would like to briefly introduce those are who are in the courtroom to support Mr. Parket, with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. RAHDERT: First, I want to note Tony Bosco, who is here who submitted a letter in support of Mr. Parket, one of Mr. Parket's close friends and victim; Victim 11, from whom the Court just heard and chooses to proceed anonymously today is here and also wrote a letter of support for Mr. Parket; and then Evan Stern, one of Mr. Parket's therapists, is here as well. And I just wanted to note that Mr. Parket's sister, Allison Berman, had an unavoidable conflict and wanted to be here but unfortunately could not.

THE COURT: I do have a letter from her, though, which obviously reflected a great deal of thought and reflection on her part as well.

MS. RAHDERT: Thank you, your Honor.

And finally, in a similar boat, is Mr. Parket's son who also submitted a letter for him --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. RAHDERT: -- who really did want to be here but, unfortunately, had an unavoidable conflict as well.

THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, all, for being here.

MS. RAHDERT: Thank you, your Honor.

We are asking for a sentence of time-served and a term of supervised release to include a significant term of home detention. We recognize that given the gravely serious nature of the offense and high guidelines range this is an unusual

request that may even seem extraordinary, but we make this request with one thing in mind and one thing only: Allowing Mr. Parket to pay full restitution to his victims, with interest.

As the Court well knows, Mr. Parket has been singularly focused on repaying his victims via a series of whistle-blower cases filed with the SEC and in one private civil action. In short, the Court can see his remorse not just through his words but through his actions since confessing his crime.

For the past two years he has lived in a series of cheap, temporary apartments paid for by his son, subsisting on a few dollars a day, and recently even relying on food banks for assistance. During that time he has engaged in extraordinary, and in our experience, even unprecedented efforts to pursue whistle-blower cases to pay restitution. His tireless work on these cases, along with their likelihood of success which I will discuss in more detail in a moment, truly set him apart from virtually all other fraud defendants. But, his ability to pursue these cases to the finish line depends on him being able to access the internet and file additional submissions, which he simply cannot do if he is incarcerated.

THE COURT: Counsel, they have internet in prison and he is represented by counsel, is he not?

MS. RAHDERT: Your Honor, the internet access in

prison is extremely limited. My understanding is that it is limited to a sort of basic e-mail program called CorrLinks where you can send limited, text only e-mails to lawyers and people on the outside. And, he has counsel on several of the cases but there are cases where he is pro se -- representing himself -- with the SEC.

Now, I want to go into the whistle-blower process in a little bit more detail. I know your Honor has reviewed the submissions carefully, of course, but Mr. Parket wants his victims who are here to be aware of the efforts that he has made and the very real possibility that they may be repaid. Obviously, although he is constrained by certain confidentiality issues in what he is able to share —

THE COURT: And he also can't make representations to people.

MS. RAHDERT: I'm sorry, your Honor?

THE COURT: He cannot make representations to his victims.

MS. RAHDERT: Understood, your Honor. And I was planning to address that at the end of my presentation but I am happy to do so now, if the Court would prefer.

Essentially, in short, Mr. Parket instructed a lawyer of his on one of the civil matters of the whistle-blower cases to communicate with counsel for one of the victims to try to share more information about the whistle-blower cases with

counsel for the victim and was told that that victim was not interested in more information. It was a lawyer-to-lawyer communication and it was motivated by the same desire that motivates my comments today in terms of sharing information with the victims about these cases which are very substantive and legitimate.

As I said, he wants to make sure his victims know about and understand as much as they are able to, consistent with this confidentiality obligations to the SEC and other regulators.

In short, after he hit rock bottom in late 2021

Mr. Parket searched for a way to try to make things as right as he could by searching for a way to pay restitution. He discovered the SEC whistle-blower program which awards qualifying whistle-blowers with between 10 and 30 percent of the judgment that the SEC collects based on the information that the whistle-blower provides. The vast majority of awards are at or close to that 30 percent level.

THE COURT: If the lawsuits succeed.

MS. RAHDERT: Correct, if the lawsuits succeed, your Honor.

He embarked on a massive effort to root out financial wrongdoing across the industry and he scoured thousands of public filings and pieced together numerous likely violations of securities laws. It was a very robust effort that he

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

undertook. The immense effort has turned paying a \$38 million restitution judgment, which at first sounds like a total fantasy, candidly, into a realistic possibility.

He has filed five cases with the SEC which include 29 supplemental submissions, two of which he submitted only just within the last week. They allege more than \$12 billion in wrongdoing across the various cases. These submissions are supported by approximately 4,000 documents. The five whistle-blower cases also consist of more than 850 pages of filings including more than 125 Excel spreadsheets. reflect the review and careful analysis, as I said, of more than 15,000 documents, some of which are voluminous public SEC They contain sophisticated claims of wrongdoing by filings. others including very large corporations and hedge funds which, if the SEC does pursue cases to judgment, would have the ability to pay large judgments, if such judgments are entered against them. One of the whistle-blower matters has also led to a private civil claim that Mr. Parket is pursuing with retained counsel who is, of course, retained on a contingency basis.

I want to highlight the letters from the attorneys on these matters that we have filed under seal.

THE COURT: I have read them.

MS. RAHDERT: Understood, your Honor. I emphasize that these letters indicate that these are real and substantial

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

efforts that have a good likelihood of success down the line.

Indeed, his work has already produced very promising results in terms of indication of governmental interest in those cases. I know your Honor pointed out during the government's presentation that there are no submissions from regulators in our sentencing package and I want to note that the fact remains that Mr. Parket is in fairly consistent communication with the SEC and attorneys for the SEC about his allegations, he has had several meetings with them and with prosecutors in the Eastern District of New York, as your Honor has also noted, and the fact is that the SEC has also filed cases publicly indicating that it could be using the information that Mr. Parket is providing. Further, these SEC investigations are themselves, as we know, confidential, and that includes confidentiality vis-à-vis Mr. Parket. The SEC is not telling Mr. Parket every step of the way its investigation. He doesn't know exactly how and when they're using his information because it is sort of a one-way street in terms of sharing information, if that makes sense.

And we also, finally, did not request letters from regulators in support of Mr. Parket's sentencing package and the reason we did not request such letters is that the purpose of Mr. Parket's whistle-blower efforts is not to try to necessarily influence the Court via letter from regulators, it is to show and demonstrate that he has a real and concrete plan

to pay restitution and is incredibly devoted to that plan. Without getting into the confidential details, of course, as we explain in our submission, there actually is good reason to believe that the SEC is actively pursuing these cases.

In addition to what I have already said, the EDNY was expressed interest in three cases and the SEC in four of them. And, again, we did not ask them for letters in support of his sentencing package.

Because of the scope of wrongdoing uncovered, if the cases are successful, Mr. Parket could be in a position to pay his restitution in full. Of course, as your Honor noted, that depends on those cases being prosecuted or enforced to conclusion. The success of his claims depends on his ability to continue that work in numerous ways. For example, Mr. Parket proactively monitors SEC actions related to entities that he is accused of wrongdoing. He then will reach out to the SEC personally, and every time a party is publicly charged, to make sure that the SEC knows about the additional wrongdoing that he personally has identified through his analysis, even if it is unrelated to the charges that the SEC filed against that entity. He won't be able to monitor for those investments and conduct that outreach from prison.

He also --

THE COURT: Again, he is represented by counsel in many of those cases. He certainly can do that.

MS. RAHDERT: Understood, your Honor, he is represented by counsel in some cases, and I note that although he is represented by counsel, Mr. Parket's personal effort is critical to the success of these claims because of the sheer number of entities that he has accused of wrongdoing. I think it is approximately 400 entities that are involved in his whistle-blower cases, some of whom change their names at different times and it is very difficult to get your arms around all of the activity related to these entities. Although his counsel on those cases is quite capable and has invested a lot of time, Mr. Parket's personal efforts are essential to making sure that all 400 of those names are monitored on a regular basis.

He also continues to bolster his whistle-blower cases by filing supplemental submissions that we have alluded to. Those submissions are really important because they keep the cases top of mind for the SEC. And, the more information that he provides in supplemental submissions the more likely the SEC is to value his assistance and give him a higher percentage of the ultimate judgment because there is that 10 to 30 percent range and my understanding is that one factor considered is the amount of assistance provided by the whistle-blower.

This activity is critical to his success and, again, something that he would not be able to do if incarcerated. Not only that, but if and when the SEC does obtain a qualifying

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

judgment, the SEC will post what is called a notice of covered action and Mr. Parket will have to go online and monitor for notices of covered actions so he can apply for an award within 90 days of the publication of that notice. If he does not apply for that award within 90 days, then he does not collect anything as a whistle-blower.

And to your Honor's point, even in cases where he is represented by counsel, because of the sheer number of entities involved here, monitoring for notices of covered actions is a very difficult task that really requires Mr. Parket's persistent and sometime intensive effort. This means that if he is incarcerated, it is just unlikely that the victims will That's the bottom line here. And given that his be repaid. incredible effort and the likelihood of successfully paying victims back, in whole or even in extremely large part, we submit that the 3553(a) factor of the need to provide restitution to the victims should be weighed very heavily in the Court's sentencing determination today. That factor favors a sentence that allows him to continue this work and make his victims whole financially. Courts rely on that factor in imposing non-custodial sentences where the facts support that outcome and, as we submit they do here. Indeed, Victim 11 wrote in his victim impact statement that the most important thing to him is being repaid and he said that again to the Court today.

THE COURT: He spoke to me earlier, yes.

MS. RAHDERT: Of course. That victim, therefore, asks the Court to sentence Mr. Parket in a way that permits him to continue that work.

And I also want to note, in addition to paying restitution to the victims, the whistle-blower process serves another important purpose for Mr. Parket. He seeks to atone for his offenses by assisting the government in rooting out financial frauds and helping other victims of wrongdoing, that is, victims of the wrongdoing that he alleges in the whistle-blower cases which, of course, had nothing to do with his offense and he was not involved in any of those allegations. It shows his remorse and desire to pay his debt to society, albeit in a unique way.

Although Mr. Parket's efforts to repay his victims are the principal reason for the sentence that we request, I want to spend just a couple of minutes on other 3553(a) factors that we hope the Court considers.

Mr. Parket's voluntary, full, and thorough confession, without any proffer agreement or protections of any kind, is another extraordinary aspect of Mr. Parket's post-offense conduct that should be recognized in the Court's sentence today.

After Mr. Parket attempted --

THE COURT: Did he ask for a cooperation letter? 5K

letter?

MS. RAHDERT: I am not aware of him ever asking for a cooperation letter, no.

THE COURT: And he doesn't have one.

MS. RAHDERT: Correct.

After he attempted suicide in 2021, Mr. Parket hired a lawyer and contacted federal prosecutors to make a full confession. When he first contacted the Eastern District of New York, he did not know that SDNY had already started an investigation. As far as he knew there was no criminal authority interested in his conduct. Whether the SDNY had already been contacted by victims, therefore, does not undermine the importance of Mr. Parket's confession which he sought to give before he knew he was in criminal jeopardy. The point is what was in his head at that time, and in his mind he did not know that he was under investigation. He then cooperated extensively in his own prosecution by preparing a written narrative of his offense and assisting with calculating his restitution obligation, which is a complicated effort, given the nature of the offense.

We ask the Court to recognize his cooperation in his own case and in the whistle-blower cases in imposing sentence even though, as your Honor notes and as the government noted, he was never a formal 5K cooperator. We are not saying he should be treated as such. We are saying that he shares

characteristics with cooperators that are valuable and are important in considering 3553(a) factors and support the sentence that we request today.

The government, in its submission and in its comments today, undervalues the importance of his confession when it asks for a guideline sentence. Mr. Parket confessed, as I mentioned, because he could no longer live with all of the lies that he told. He felt shame, remorse, and as the Court knows, deep depression, and wanted to make things right. The government mischaracterizes his confession as self-serving without any factual basis, and the government asserts that his confession was unnecessary but, of course, the point is that Mr. Parket did not know that. He did not know that the government was investigating him at the time.

I also note that the government told the Probation Office that Mr. Parket did provide substantial assistance in his own prosecution by preparing documents and assisting with the restitution calculation so that assistance we hope will be noted by the Court in his sentence. Not only that, but SDNY has made it clear that in the corporate context, at least, that voluntarily disclosing wrongdoing merits charging and sentencing leniency in its corporate voluntary disclosure policy. In fact, just yesterday the SDNY announced a new policy permitting individual whistle-blowers who cooperate and identify certain types of corporate criminal misconduct and

public corruption, to obtain non-prosecution agreements. In announcing that policy, SDNY emphasized the importance of incentivizing self-disclosure. Your Honor should, therefore, weigh Mr. Parket's voluntary confession heavily in your sentencing decision.

I note that the government highlighted general deterrence as a factor that is important here. in addition to considering general deterrence I think it is important to send a message that self-disclosure and voluntary confessions will be considered in sentences and will be factored in as a reason for a downward variance to incentivize others to engage in similar post-offense conduct in the future, which we understand is the purpose of the newly enacted policy in SDNY, or at least one purpose of it.

Next, I want to briefly touch on just two additional 3553 factors that are really important here. The first one is the need for adequate mental health treatment. As the Court knows, in detail, Mr. Parket's mental health challenges have been well-documented here, beginning with his suicide attempt in the winter of 2021. Since then he has received robust mental health treatment which has been essential to his survival, really. He sees three different therapists, one of whom he speaks with three times a week. He will not have access to that level of treatment or perhaps any treatment at all in Bureau of Prisons custody. Courts regularly consider

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this issue in imposing downward variances in sentences.

Finally, I want to say a few words about Mr. Parket's history and characteristics. His crimes are, no doubt, gravely serious, we understand that completely, and they impacted, even devastated, many people, financially and emotionally. He has never disputed that and he feels deep remorse for causing such lasting severe pain to so many people including people he cares about extremely deeply. But his crimes must be looked at in the context of his whole life. Like all of us, he is more than the worst wrongs he has ever committed. Although the crimes lasted several years, it was for Mr. Parket an aberration in his whole life. For the first 55 years of his life Mr. Parket abided by every law and rule. He was a pillar of integrity for his friends and family, and the Court can see that in the letters that were submitted in support of his sentencing application. In this regard, it is especially noteworthy that a victim of Mr. Parket's crimes wrote a letter of support --Victim 11 -- and who spoke here to your Honor today. This was Exhibit 5 to our submission. In his letter, and today, he described his friendship with Mr. Parket and the ways in which Mr. Parket showed unyielding support for him during very hard times. Even though Mr. Parket defrauded this victim out of a substantial amount of money, I think what for any person would be a substantial amount of money, he still sees the good in Mr. Parket and the value of his work in attempting to fulfill

his restitution obligation. We only ask the Court do the same here, to view Mr. Parket and his life as a whole and with an emphasis on his whistle-blower work and post-offense conduct and to impose a sentence that permits him to make his wrongs as right as he can by paying back every penny that is owed. For these reasons, and the many others raised in our submission, we ask the Court to impose a sentence of time-served with a term of supervision and a substantial term of home detention.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. RAHDERT: If I may note one additional point, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. RAHDERT: I know your Honor said that the Court, of course, read in detail the written victim impact statements.

THE COURT: I have also read all the submissions made by everybody including all the statements made on behalf of Mr. Parket.

MS. RAHDERT: Of course, your Honor. And Mr. Parket, I cannot stress this enough, deeply regrets all of the harm that he caused and the real devastation that is reflected in those statements. That said, there are a couple of points on which there are facts where the victims are mistaken, and I just wanted to note those so that the record is clear in terms of Mr. Parket's life so the Court has all the accurate information.

The one I want to highlight actually here, it is only one, where in Victims 1's statement Mr. Parket, as I mentioned, did not live a life of luxury after his offense conduct here and after his confession. He lived on just a few dollars a day. His inexpensive housing was funded by his son and he took public transportation and otherwise lived a very frugal lifestyle as he has been building these whistle-blower cases.

I just wanted to make sure that was clear to the Court.

THE COURT: I didn't understand the statement by the victim to be saying that after his fraud was revealed he lived a life of luxury. I understood it to be saying that the victim believes that Mr. Parket engaged in the fraud that he engaged in in order to continue living what was then a very comfortable life.

MS. RAHDERT: Understood, your Honor. I'm sorry if it was unclear. I wanted to make sure that that was clear for the record.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. RAHDERT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Parket, at this time, if you wish, the Court is happy to hear from you. You are not obligated to address the Court but you certainly have the right and I am certainly open to hearing anything you might want to say to me.

THE DEFENDANT: I appreciate it, your Honor. I have a

few things that I would like to say, both to the Court and to the people that are here that I have hurt.

THE COURT: Sure.

THE DEFENDANT: Listening to everything that everybody said today, your Honor, the sentiments that each person has said, the sentiments that were made by people in the victim impact letters, I have done horrible things, I have hurt people terribly. And not talking financially, I am talking emotionally also.

I can never make up for everything that I have done but I would like each person to know how sorry I am that I lied. I lied, I deceived my family, deceived friends, and deceived people that I barely knew. I can never make right the emotional pain that I have caused everyone, but I will repay each person what they are owed. It is my responsibility and it is my only mission left in life.

I know, I knew and I continue to know right from wrong. In the spring of 2018 I recklessly lost my life savings. There is no excuse for my actions. For years I lied to people and I falsified documents so that people would lend me money. Even if I had repaid everyone, what I did was still horribly, horribly wrong. Two years later, after speaking to therapists and a psychiatrist five times each week, I still do not know how, after leading a proper life for 55 years, I became a criminal.

In November of 2021, I hit rock bottom. I could not lie to anyone anymore. I attempted to commit suicide. I spent a good deal of time at Gracie Square in their psychiatric ward. I knew I had to make amends to people that I hurt and I asked my lawyer to reach out to the United States Attorney's office so I could admit my wrongdoing. This was done prior to my being aware of any investigation into me and to my activities.

I was interviewed twice by the SDNY and I confessed to all of my crimes. I provided them with the names of victims that they were unaware of, and I gave them detailed spreadsheets of what I stole. In pleading guilty, my primary motivation was to atone for my crimes and to make sure that my victims are being repaid first before anything goes to the government. I have been assured that it is the policy of SDNY that any money that I earn will go to the victims before the government gets anything for itself.

Repaying people seemed like an impossible task until I learned about the Securities and Exchange Commission whistle-blower program in December of 2021. I found a purpose, I found a reason to live, it was a vehicle to begin atoning for all of my sins.

Earning the money to repay each person in principal and interest does not excuse my actions in any way but it is just a first step forward. Accomplishing this is my goal in life. On average, I spend at least 16 to 18 hours each day,

each and every day of the week, working on these whistle-blower activities. I am speaking about them today so the victims have some information about my efforts to repay them. I had actually asked, when I asked my other attorney to reach out to the victim, it was solely because I had wanted, for the last two years, to let people know what I am doing to try to take steps forward to repay them. It was not done to influence anybody in any way, it was done purely to inform.

The cases that I have put together from independent research identify more than \$12 billion in wrongdoing. I identified and documented significant crimes in securities markets. In 2023, I participated in 21 formal interviews and informal discussions with the SEC and federal prosecutors at EDNY. I allege that more than 70 times, hedge funds illegally shorted stocks in advance of a securities offering and more than 100 times issuers of hedge funds filed either falsified documents, contradictory documents, or just plain failed to make required filings to the SEC. Accounting firms negligently approved inappropriate implied volatility assumptions in audited financial statements which resulted in false and misleading income statements for public companies. I am also pursuing a civil matter against a hedge fund for a securities law claim that is covered by strict liability.

The information I provided was previously unknown to the EDNY and the SEC. These agencies have opened formal

investigations into four of the five cases that I filed. In just the past three years, seven investment banks improperly collected more than \$950 million in fees. Nine hedge funds, ranging from \$200 million to more than \$25 billion in assets under management, improperly earned more than \$3 billion dollars. 400 corporate issuers violated securities laws by improperly raising more than \$14 billion dollars in new capital. Investors lost more than \$12 million in transactions. Regulators have demonstrated an interest in my allegations against many of these parties. Successfully repaying victims is not reliant on any one prosecution or regulatory lawsuit. Even a small number of convictions or settlements would enable me to repay each person.

For me to succeed in completing this mission to repay my victims, I still have a tremendous amount of work left to do. I have requested a punishment of home confinement so I will be repay each victim of my crime. The Bureau of Prisons has told me that if I were incarcerated, that I will be unable to scour the SEC's website, I will be unable to prepare supplemental submissions and construct spreadsheets and provide the SEC with additional information each time they charge another person that I have identified.

The SEC expects a whistle-blower, whose submissions on based on independent analysis, to proactively and continue to provide new information to them to use in order to earn the

maximum percentage payout. Even with a short sentence, the statute of limitations will expire on many of my claims before I can resume my work. In some instances, they expire this year. If I am permitted to keep working, I believe certain facets of my allegations will be resolved and will be able to repay the victims starting in 2024.

Since February 17, 2022, I have filed five separate whistle-blower complaints and 29 supplemental submissions with the SEC. I am also pursuing a separate civil matter. The submissions encompassed more than 850 pages and an additional 125 Excel spreadsheets. The 34 submissions are substantiated by more than 4,000 documents. This is material has been reviewed, edited, and verified by the attorneys who represent me.

The SEC interviewed me in September after I documented in 11 submissions that a hedge fund, with more than \$20 billion assets under management, acted as an unregistered broker-dealer and illegally distributed hundreds of millions of shares on behalf of an issuer. The proceeds were then used to repay other investors. At its core, this was a \$4 billion Ponzi scheme. I uncovered and provided evidence to the SEC that this issuer and their law firm, one of the largest and most prestigious in the country, recklessly lied by misstating significant facts. This evidence included documents showing that the chief financial officer and the general counsel each

made contradictory statements under oath to the SEC and under penalty of perjury to the bankruptcy court. I have previously you with a supplemental submission focused on this matter.

Last year, the SEC charged a hedge fund, central to my allegations, with violations of fraud, misrepresentation,

Reg SHO, and other violative trading. I provided the SEC with additional information about the hedge fund's violation of Rule 105 of regulation M and insider trading. I have had multiple discussions with the SEC about this fund and expect that I will be eligible for a reward when the case is resolved.

At least seven parties named in my complaints have already been charged by the SEC, four of those under my specific theories. For the others, it is a proof of concept that these parties may be violating SEC regulations. If any victims would like additional information, I encourage them to reach out to my counsel.

Your Honor, if you would like specific details as to the alleged crimes I have uncovered, the effort to review all of my submissions, the names of the underwriters, the issuers, the hedge funds, the law firms, and the Exchange who have violated civil and criminal losses, as well as the particulars of my interviews with the SEC and EDNY, I will answer any questions you might have.

If I am incarcerated there is no guarantee that the SEC will continue to focus on my allegations. I will almost

certainly receive a smaller percentage payout by the SEC for my whistle-blower award because I will not be able to provide the same level of assistance to the SEC in jail. This will reduce or eliminate my ability to repay victims. The SEC expects a whistle-blower, whose submissions are based on independent analysis, to proactively and continuously provide new information for them to use and to earn the maximum payout. The SEC has repeatedly asked me for additional information on topics discussed during interviews. I need these cases to remain a priority at the SEC.

Qualifying for a whistle-blower award a process. The SEC views my work as significant. They are investigating submissions and have acknowledged the information is unique and was previously not known to them. They have conducted many interviews of me and said it is likely they will want to interview me further.

I am painfully aware that my acts have devastated many victims, both financially and emotionally. I have also shattered family relationships. My wife divorced me, two of my three sons have not spoken with me in more than two years. There are very few people that still speak with me.

Your Honor, I am not looking to escape accountability for my crimes because of my efforts to repay each person I have hurt. I understand that a sentence of incarceration is deserved in light of my crimes. I wish there was a facility

where I could be incarcerated and still continue doing the work necessary to repay people. Alternatively, I wish you could sentence me to home confinement so I could repay each person and then impose the incarceration I deserve. I am devastated about the lies that I told. I have no excuse for anything that I have done. I understand that repaying people will not repair these relationship.

Today, two years after I filed my first whistle-blower case, the path to repaying each person is clear and has a high probability of success if I am allowed to keep working. I pray you will sentence me in a way that will make it possible for the victims to be repaid.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

At this time I will describe the sentence that I am intending to impose and my statement of reasons. Before sentence is finally imposed the attorneys will have an opportunity to make any legal objections to the sentence that I outline.

I note at the outset, as I said before, that the guidelines calculation that's contained in the PSR is consistent with what the parties stipulated to. It is also consistent with my own independent calculation of the guidelines range so I'm going to run through that relatively briefly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I used the November 2023 guidelines manual. Counts One and Three are grouped together for purposes of the calculation. The guidelines applicable for the violations at issue here is Section 2B1.1. Because the fraud offense carries statutory maximum term of 20 years of imprisonment or more, the base offense level is 7. Because Mr. Parket is responsible for losses of more than \$25 million but less than \$65 million, 22 offense levels are added. There are also several applicable specific offense characteristics. Two offense levels have been added because the offense involved 10 or more victims. additional two levels are added because the offense involved sophisticated means and Mr. Parket intentionally engaged in or caused the conduct constituting sophisticated means. additional two levels are added because the offense involved the possession or use of an authentication feature. no applicable victim-related adjustments or adjustments for role in the offense or for obstruction of justice. adjusted offense level is therefore 35, and then I subtracted three offense levels, as I noted earlier, two for acceptance of responsibility and one for timely notice of an intent to enter a plea. Mr. Parket's resulting total offense level is 32, he has zero criminal history points, putting him in Criminal History Category I. The quidelines range for Counts One and Three is 121 to 151 months of imprisonment.

Now, in addition to the sentencing guidelines I also

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

very carefully considered, as I must, all of the factors that have been set forth by Congress in a statute at 18 United States Code, Section 3553. A number of you have heard throughout counsel's comments reference to or discussion about the 3553 factors. That's what we are talking about here and I have carefully and seriously considered and weighed all of these factors. Those factors include the nature and the circumstance of the offense and the history and characteristics of Mr. Parket, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide a just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes by Mr. Parket, to provide Mr. Parket with needed educational/vocational training, any medical care or other correctional treatment, in the most effective manner. I am also instructed, as I said I have, to consider the sentencing quidelines that we have been talking about as well as the policy statements that are issued by the Sentencing Commission that promulgates these guidelines which are ultimately adopted into law by Congress. There is also a need to avoid unwarranted disparities in sentencings among similarly situated defendants and to provide restitution to the victims of Mr. Parket's crimes.

I have carefully weighed all of these factors and I have given substantial thought to what is an appropriate

sentence in this case. I have concluded that a sentence, a guidelines range sentence is appropriate in this case. I simply cannot, weighing all of those factors, sentence

Mr. Parket to time-served. And, frankly, I don't think it was a reasonable request to have been made in light of the record before me. I will outline several of the factors that lead me to that conclusion. I begin with the seriousness of the offense.

Mr. Parket, over the course of approximately five years, you participated in a complex, extensive, sophisticated, elaborate fraud scheme that spanned five different states. To perpetuate that fraud you fabricated hundreds of pages of elaborate paperwork and you impersonated other real people. You went to great lengths to perpetrate this fraud. You built lie upon lie and you deceived countless people. In doing so, you drew on your extensive experience and connections in the finance world to construct an intricate years' long fraud. That fraud, your crimes, were cold, they were senseless, they were manipulative, and they were calculating.

In committing your offenses you harmed and destroyed the lives of many, many people. I have listened to several of those people who spoke to me today and I have read very carefully the very impactful statements by people who didn't come and talk today. All of those people took time out of their busy lives to address the Court, either in writing or in

person, and they spoke to the harm and the pain that your actions have put them through. I have read all of those victim impact statements and I have read all of the letters that were submitted on your behalf as well.

It's appalling to the Court that several of the people of whom you took advantage were your own family members, your friends, your colleagues. You capitalized on your relationship with these people, the trust they placed in you, the love they had for you. This includes three of your sons and your stepmother. You knowingly abused their love and trust of some of the most important people in your life. Ultimately, your criminal activity will have significant and lasting consequences for every single person you have injured and that counsels in favor of a serious sentence as just punishment.

I have looked very carefully at your history and your personal characteristics. By all indications, you had a very happy, stable childhood and a loving family life. You were never exposed to any form of abuse, poverty, violence, maltreatment, substance abuse. You lived a quite comfortable, if not a wealthier lifestyle. By your own account, your best childhood memories were spent with your loving parents. Prior to your criminal conduct, you were in a long, stable, and happy marriage and your three sons clearly loved, adored, and looked up to you.

I read your many letters of support. I recognize the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

charitable work that you have done both before and after your crimes came to light.

Your strong ties to your family and your friends, your stable upbringing, all of those things make your conduct all the more troubling. You are extremely well educated, you possess multiple higher education degrees. You have had extensive employment experience in the financial sector working as the manager for various hedge funds, an independent stock trader, a senior executive vice president of a financial institution, among others.

I understand there came a point that you incurred or suffered some serious personal hardships. Specifically, I am referencing your wife's illness and the death of your father. Those types of hardships are suffered by many, many people. Ιn fact, all of us or most of us, ultimately endure the loss of parents. You say thereafter and as a result you incurred significant financial losses. Again, many, many people face serious financial difficulties. But, instead of leveraging your extensive knowledge, your intellect, your experience to get yourself back on your feet, instead of using your God-given talents and skills as you are now trying to do in connection with the whistle-blower cases to get out of the bad financial predicament you got yourself into, you used your knowledge to harm and deceive others and, as you just told me, you knew what you were doing was wrong. Your conduct does not appear to the

Court to appear to have been driven by a failed support system, poverty, or lack of education. Your actions were driven by nothing but greed.

I must consider and I have considered the need for both specific and general deterrence. I do recognize that you have no criminal history, but I cannot agree that age or lack of prior criminal history nullifies or even minimizes the need for specific deterrence in this case. Frankly, the only relationship that your age has in terms of my weighing an appropriate sentence here is that by the time you committed the conduct at issue here, you had built up substantial knowledge and expertise and you used that knowledge and expertise to engage in serious criminal conduct.

You argue that your lack of criminal history makes this crime an anomaly, makes it aberrant in an otherwise law-abiding life. But this was not a one-off incident. As I said earlier, you perpetrated this fraud over the course of close to five years and you devoted enormous amounts of time and energy to keep it running and to keep it hidden. That conduct warrants just punishment.

There is also a serious need for general deterrence in these circumstances. I have an obligation to send a message that this country does not tolerate this kind of fraudulent and abusive behavior. I have an obligation to promote respect for the law.

Now, your lawyer talked to me about the fact that I should send a message that self-reporting one's misconduct will be rewarded. The more important message for me to send is that people shouldn't engage in this type of conduct in the first place.

I am also mindful, and I credit defense counsel's arguments, pertaining to the loss amount under the tables and sentencing guidelines which resulted in the 22-level increase in your offense level. I have carefully considered that argument and I do acknowledge that the Second Circuit has recognized that in some circumstances there can be a disproportionate impact from the loss amount enhancement. I have weighed that consideration but I note here that the harm that you have done is not simply the dollar amount of loss that you have caused. You destroyed people's lives. You caused devastating harm, emotionally and mentally, to the health and well-being of your victims, to their sense of stability, their sense of trust, to their peace of mind, and that loss cannot be calculated and needs to be weighed, as well, in terms of an appropriate sentence.

Now, I acknowledge that you have repeatedly expressed remorse for your conduct. I recognize that you proffered with the government, that you confessed to your wrong, but you did that only at a time when your wrong was already beginning to unravel, whether you knew that or not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I acknowledge, as well, the multiple whistle-blower suits that you have filed in an attempt to obtain whistle-blower awards which you want to use towards victim restitution payments. This is one of the main arguments that your attorney made and, frankly, you made, standing up and arquing to me the merits of the suits that you are involved with. You both rely on that very heavily in terms of an ability to pay restitution to your victims and you say that depends on your staying out of prison, serving your sentence in the community, so that you can continue to be able to pursue those whistle-blower actions. I reject that argument in its I reject that that's the only way for you to continue to work on those whistle-blower cases. As I said before, there is internet in prisons, you have attorneys representing you in those cases. If the SEC needs to speak with you, it will know where to find you. If appropriate, it can ask to have you temporarily released to meet with them and a judge will weigh whether that's appropriate. Moreover, although you are hopeful to pay restitution through these suits, there is simply no quarantee and that's what I meant when I said to counsel you cannot represent to these victims that they're going to be repaid because of these whistle-blower That would be another -- I don't want to call that a suits. fraud, but I also think it is wrong to hold out what may well be a false hope to the victims. So I want to be clear on the

record that while I am hopeful -- and I accept that Mr. Parket is hopeful that he will be able to compensate, in some respect, through those whistle-blower lawsuits. Right now that is wholly speculative. There is absolutely no guarantee. There is no guarantee the suits will succeed, there is no guarantee the SEC will act on information Mr. Parket is bringing to them. There is no guarantee that he will be given awards as a result of any lawsuits that might be successful. It is entirely too speculative to say that you should be forgiven any prison time as a result of the tremendous wrong you have done based on these whistle-blower lawsuits.

While I commend your efforts to pay restitution to your victims, those efforts do not entitle you to escape accountability for the crimes you have committed.

I just want to comment, too, on this notion that in some respect, even though there is no 5K letter, you are a cooperator. You simply are not within the meaning of the considerations that I'm supposed to weigh here. Yes, I credit that you are remorseful. Yes, I credit that you have confessed to your crimes. But you are not entitled to be treated as a cooperator in this case.

Now, your attorney also urges that the consequences of your actions since your arrest have been ample punishment. I disagree. Every defendant with far more severe impacts on their life can make that same kind of an argument. Every

mitigating circumstance that you have provided to the Court speaks to events that occurred after your fraudulent scheme came crumbling down. Your isolation from your family, your mental health issues for which I am very happy that you have been getting help, apparently meaningful help — and I will indicate in the judgment that I will enter that you should continue to get that kind of treatment while you are in prison — your inability to find employment, your pursuit of the whistle-blower cases, all of these are nothing more than direct consequences of your own selfish and criminal conduct.

Having said that, I have weighed all of that in fashioning an appropriate sentence. I have to say that there is no mitigating circumstance that I have heard in our rather lengthy discussion today that can begin to explain your reasons for engaging in this type of really egregious scheme. While I have no doubt that your arrest has had serious repercussions on your life, these are all inevitable consequences that you and other defendants face when you engage in criminal conduct.

So, for all of these reasons, it is the intent of the Court to sentence you to a term of imprisonment of 121 months, to be followed by a term of supervised release on each count of three years, to run concurrently. During that period of supervised release all of the mandatory and standard conditions set forth in the PSR will be applicable, as will the special conditions that I discussed with you earlier. The mental

health condition is warranted in light of the struggles that you have had. The search condition is justified by the fraudulent nature of your offense. And the financial conditions are warranted in order to monitor your finances, including payment of any financial penalties that I am going to impose and to prevent any additional fraud.

In addition, the PSR did not indicate but you will be supervised during that period of supervised release by the district in which you are residing.

There is a \$100 mandatory special assessment for each count. There are two counts to which you pled so there is a \$200 mandatory special assessment, payable immediately.

Now, Section 5E1.2 says that the Court shall impose a fine unless you establish that you are unable to pay. I do find, based on the record before me and the hefty restitution and forfeiture obligations, coupled with all the other financial information including the debts that you have and the fact that your son has basically been supporting you, that you do not have the ability to pay a fine so I don't intend to impose a fine.

With respect to restitution, I will enter the consent order of restitution obligating you to pay restitution in the amount of \$37,643,842.90. With respect to forfeiture, the order of forfeiture, together with the subsequent stipulation and order that I entered, it is final as of this date. I am

incorporating that in the sentence that I am imposing and it will be incorporated into the judgment in this case.

So, at this time I will pause, as I said I would do, to give counsel the opportunity to lodge any legal objections to the sentence that I have outlined. Does the government have any objections that you wish to make?

MS. CHONG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the defense wish to make any legal objections to the sentence?

MS. RAHDERT: No legal objections, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Parket, would you please stand? Sir, it is the judgment of the Court that you be remanded to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to serve a term of incarceration of 121 months. That will be followed by a term of supervised release of three years on each of the two counts, to run concurrently, and during that time the mandatory standard and special conditions of supervised release that we have been discussing will be imposed.

There is a mandatory \$100 special assessment on each count so you are responsible, immediately, to pay a \$200 mandatory special assessment.

The Court is not imposing a fine.

The restitution order that we have discussed will be part of the judgment and the Court will adopt the proposed payment schedule that was set forth in the PSR.

The order of forfeiture that's on the docket at ECF no. 39 is imposed as part of your sentence and that forfeiture order is, as I say, part of your sentence and will be incorporated into the judgment in this matter.

You may be seated.

I should note, Mr. Parket has been on release throughout the life of this case. I do find, based on the recommendation of probation, that he is a candidate worthy of voluntary surrender so I will include in the judgment that he surrender on April 11 of this year at the facility to be designated by the Bureau of Prisons. If, for any reason, the Bureau of Prisons hasn't designated by then, you will be in touch with the Court please, counsel, and we will modify that. All right?

MS. RAHDERT: Your Honor, if I may be heard very briefly on designation?

THE COURT: Yes. I was going to ask you that but go ahead. Sure.

MS. RAHDERT: Sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, that's all right.

MS. RAHDERT: We respectfully request that the Court recommend to the Bureau of Prisons designation at a facility as close to New York as possible.

THE COURT: To New York City.

MS. RAHDERT: Correct; yes, New York City, excuse me.

And I know your Honor mentioned that mental health treatment would be part of the Court's judgment, but also noting that a facility with robust mental health treatment could be the recommended designation as well.

THE COURT: I will include both of those in the judgment.

MS. RAHDERT: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Is there a motion by the government to dismiss any open counts?

MS. CHONG: Yes, your Honor. The government moves to dismiss the two open counts.

THE COURT: That motion is granted and that will be reflected in the judgment as well.

Now, Mr. Parket, I should tell you that to the extent you haven't waived it in the plea agreement that you entered into with the government, you do have a right to appeal from both your conviction and from your sentence. If you are unable to pay the costs of any appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. Any notice of appeal by you has to be filed within 14 days of entry of the judgment. Given the late hour today the judgment will not get entered today but it most certainly will be entered tomorrow, so that will start the clock running on any time to appeal. Do you understand, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Is there anything further for the record?

01B5parS MS. CHONG: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Counsel? MS. RAHDERT: Nothing further, your Honor. THE COURT: So all that remains, Mr. Parket, I wish you well. I hope that you will use the time that you are in prison to try to think about how you can use your many, many gifts and talents to benefit society and first your victims. wish you well. I thank our court reporter. With that, we will stand adjourned. Thank you.